

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/633,669	Applicant(s) SHIMAZAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin M. Bernatz	Art Unit 1773	

All Participants:

 (1) Kevin M. Bernatz.

 (2) Julie Seaman.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 March 2005
Time: AM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1-11

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the Examiner indicated that applicants' arguments of unexpected results did not appear to be commensurate in scope with the claimed invention, since applicants arguments centered upon the obtainment of a high J_k value, which is not presently claimed in claim 1. The Examiner indicated that applicants data (e.g. examples 8 versus 21) indicate that the choice of materials and thickness values of the ferromagnetic layer sandwich directly impacts the value of J_k obtained. Since the disclosed invention meeting the alleged unexpected results possesses a J_k value of 263 uJ/m² or higher, the Examiner indicated that inclusion of such a limitation into claim 1 would appear to bring the claims into condition for allowance since they would then be commensurate in scope with the unexpected results shown by applicants..